

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 3 and 7 are independent claims. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 4 and 6 are amended.

Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully solicited.

Applicant respectfully requests entry of the present Amendment After Final in that the amendments to the claims do not raise any new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. For example, the amendment to independent claim 1 merely clarifies the claims, in an effort to overcome the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph. Accordingly, entry of these claim amendments and allowance of each of claims 1-7 is earnestly solicited in connection with the present application.

Drawing Objections

The Office Action objects to the drawings for not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims.

This objection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that the base-emitter junction is definitely shown in at least Fig. 17.

Specifically, applicant respectfully points out that in claim 4 of the present invention, the base-emitter junction is part of a bipolar transistor which functions as a diode. The bipolar transistor Tr121 of Fig. 17, for example, although not

showing the base-collector junction, does show the base-emitter junction functioning as a diode.

As such, the base-collector junction of the bipolar transistor Tr121 of Fig. 17 does not function as a diode because the base terminal and collector terminal are connected to each other.

On the other hand, the base-emitter junction of the bipolar transistor Tr121 of Fig. 17 functions as a diode because the base terminal and emitter terminal are not connected to each other.

As such, applicant respectfully submits that one having ordinary skill in the art would understand that, if one of the base-emitter junction and the base-collector junction is shown, the other of the base-emitter junction and the base-collector junction are also inherently shown.

Also, as to the gate-drain junction of claim 6 and Fig. 19, applicant submits that the same reasoning is applicable. Fig. 19 clearly shows the gate-source junction of a field effect transistor. As such, one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the gate-drain junction is inherently shown when the gate-source junction is shown. This is at least because the drain and source are replaceable in the field effect transistor.

For at least the reasons noted above, applicant respectfully submits that the drawings do indeed show each and every feature as set forth in the claims.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 3 and 7 over the art of record.

The Office Action also indicates that claims 4-6 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph.

However, applicant respectfully submits that all of claims 1-7 are allowable, for at least the reasons set forth below.

The Claims Satisfy The Requirements Of
35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd Paragraph

The Office Action reject claims 1, 4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment to claim 1, 4 and 6 obviates the rejection of claim 1, 4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph is respectfully solicited.

The Claim Objections Are Obviated

The Office Action objects to claims 4 and 6 for minor informalities contained therein. This objection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment to claim 4 and 6 obviates the objection of the claims.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to claims 4 and 6 is respectfully solicited.

The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The final Office Action makes the following rejection:

(1) claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,275,362 to Harford (hereafter Harford).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that Harford fails to teach or suggest each and every feature as set forth in the claimed invention.

The Examiner alleges that Hartford discloses a transistor 110 that can be read as a power amplifier and a PIN diode 112 connected between a grounding terminal (emitter) of the power amplifier and ground. (see final Office Action, page 4).

However, applicant respectfully submits that Hartford's transistor 110 is merely arranged in a common emitter amplifier configuration with its collector coupled to the B+ supply by load resistor 116 and the emitter coupled to ground by a *parallel combination* of a PIN diode 112 and a resistor 114. (see Hartford, col. 4, lines 8-18).

In contrast with Hartford, the present application discloses a power amplification circuit 21 made up of a power amplifier 22 and a *serial* negative feedback circuit 23 connected between a grounding terminal of the power amp 22 and the ground. (see present application, Fig. 2 and page 30, paragraph [0052]).

As such, in the present invention, claim 1 includes a serial circuit connected between a grounding terminal of the power amp 22 and the ground, instead of a parallel configuration as shown in Hartford's Fig. 1.

For at least the reasons set forth above, applicant submits that the claimed invention is distinguishable from Hartford.

According to MPEP §2131, "a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ...claims." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claims, but this is not an *ipsissimis verbis* test, i.e., identity of terminology is not required. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action has failed to establish the required *prima facie* case of anticipation because the cited reference, Harford, fails to teach or suggest each and every feature as set forth in the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is allowable over Harford for at least the reasons noted above.

As for each of the dependent claims not particularly discussed above, these claims are also allowable for at least the reasons set forth above regarding their corresponding independent claims, and/or for the further features claimed therein.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully solicited.

Application No. 10/706,138
Amendment dated August 19, 2005
After Final Office Action of April 19, 2005

Docket No.: 0020-5190P

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Carolyn T. Baumgardner (Reg. No. 41,345) at (703) 205-8000 to schedule a Personal Interview.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment from or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. §1.17; particularly, the extension of time fees.

Dated: August 19, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Terrell C. Birch

Registration No.: 19,382

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Rd

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

08/19